

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the specification under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for applicant's claimed "computer-readable medium" in Claim 7. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this object. Note, for example, the systems/servers in Figure 1.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2, 7, 9, 12 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakalash et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,604) in view of Carothers et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0016771). The Examiner has further rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bakalash et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejections, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove to each of the independent claims. Specifically, applicant has substantially incorporated the subject matter of Claims 16 and 20-21 into each of the independent claims.

With respect to each of the independent claims, the Examiner has relied on item 22 in Figure 6A and Col. 10, lines 62-63 in Bakalash to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "pre-processing said obtained operational data by a stepwise operation, wherein only the last operated upon data is recorded such that data recording is avoided during data addition for efficiency purposes" (see the same or similar, but not necessarily identical language in each of the independent claims). Specifically, the Examiner has argued that Bakalash's "MDD Aggregation Module...is equivalent to a preprocessing module" and Bakalash's "stored aggregated data corresponds to only the last operated upon data which is last recorded."

Applicant respectfully points out that the excerpt in Bakalash relied on by the Examiner discloses that the "MDD Aggregation Module...stores atomic data and aggregated data." Applicant, on the other hand, claims that "only the last operated upon data is recorded" (emphasis added), and not that both atomic data and aggregated data is stored, as in Bakalash.

- 9 -

With respect to independent Claims 1, 2, 7 and 9, the Examiner has relied on Figures 5 and 7 and paragraph [0058] in Carothers to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "transforming said pre-processed data into subject-oriented data by utilizing reusable primary keys and Relational Database Management System dates in an operating system of the source system to link related pre-processed data" (see the same or similar, but not necessarily identical language in the foregoing claims). In particular, the Examiner has stated that "Figures 5 and 7 illustrate utilizing reusable primary keys on the source system and relational database management dates" and that "the unique integer key [in paragraph [0058]] is equivalent to a primary key."

Applicant respectfully asserts that Figures 5 actually discloses a DAKeyGen.exe which "assigns a unique integer 'long' key value to each record in each text file" (see paragraph [0057]). Thus, since applicant claims "utilizing reusable primary keys" (emphasis added), Carothers' disclosure of unique key values *teaches away* from applicant's claim language. In addition, the only dates mentioned with respect to Figure 7 relate to "extract[ing] a range of MIS log file records, based on a beginning and ending date" (see paragraph [0075]). Clearly, a beginning and ending date does not meet applicant's claimed "transforming said pre-processed data into subject-oriented data by utilizing... Relational Database Management System dates in an operating system of the source system to link related pre-processed data" (emphasis added).

Still with respect to independent Claims 1, 2, 7 and 9, the Examiner has relied on Col. 12, lines 55-64 in Bakalash to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed technique "wherein said dates within said Relational Database Management System in said operating system of said source system are obtained by trigger or log-scraping of said Relational Database Management System." Applicant respectfully asserts that in Bakalash the trigger mechanism is used in linking the RDMBS system to the data. Applicant, on the other hand, claims "dates obtained by trigger or log-scraping" (emphasis added). Clearly, a trigger used to link a system to data does not meet any sort of trigger or log-scraping that is used to obtain dates, in the manner claimed by applicant.

- 10 -

With respect to independent Claim 5, the Examiner has relied on Col. 12, lines 55-64 in Bakalash to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "transforming said pre-processed data records into related subject-oriented data records, wherein said transforming comprises linking related pre-processed data records together by means of reusable primary keys on said source system and dates obtained by trigger or log-scraping a Relational Database Management System in an operating system of said legacy source system." Applicant respectfully asserts that such excerpt does not even suggest any sort of reusable primary keys, as claimed by applicant. In addition, Bakalash only discloses "enabl[ing] the RDBMS system to reference and link to the data generated by the MDD Aggregation Module." Thus, in Bakalash only the system is linked to the data, which clearly does not meet applicant's claimed "linking related pre-processed data records" (emphasis added). Furthermore, as argued above with respect to the remaining independent claims, Bakalash discloses a trigger mechanism for use in linking the RDMBS system to the data, whereas applicant claims "dates obtained by trigger or log-scraping" (emphasis added).

With respect to the 102 rejection, the Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

With respect to the 103 rejection, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The

- 11 -

teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir.1991).

Applicant respectfully asserts that the Bakalash reference, when taken alone and in combination with Carothers, does not meet all of applicant's specific claim language, as noted above. Nevertheless, despite such paramount deficiencies and in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application, applicant has at least substantially incorporated the subject matter of Claims 16 and 20-21 into each of the independent claims.

With respect to the subject matter of Claim 16, presently incorporated, at least in part, into each of the independent claims, the Examiner has rejected the same under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakalash, in view of Carothers, in further view of Foote et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,714,945). In particular, the Examiner has relied on Col. 9, lines 45-47 in Foote to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed technique "wherein said pre-processing includes an insert function that returns a warning when associated subject-oriented data already exists in said historical data warehouse." Specifically, the Examiner has stated that Foote's disclosed "return code" is equivalent to applicant's claimed "warning." Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, Foote's return code is only sent in order for the system to determine whether an update or search was successful. Clearly, only determining whether an update or search was successful does not meet applicant's claimed "insert function that returns a warning when associated subject-oriented data already exists in said historical data warehouse" (emphasis added).

With respect to the subject matter of Claim 20, the Examiner has relied on Figures 5A and 5B in Bakalash to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed technique "wherein said Relational Database Management System dates are utilized for distinctly characterizing said subject-oriented data when a plurality of tables containing operational data with duplicate primary keys are combined in said historical data warehouse." Specifically, the Examiner has stated that the "facts table [in Bakalash] illustrates

- 12 -

operational data with duplicate primary keys [that] are combined in said data warehouse.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In particular, Bakalash expressly discloses that “[e]ach row within the central fact table includes a multi-part key associated with a set of facts” (see Col. 4, lines 1-3). Thus, Figures 5A and 5B merely show a multi-part key that consists of a markets dimension, a products dimension and a period dimension. Simply nowhere does Bakalash specifically teach that such multi-part keys are duplicate primary keys, as applicant claims. Furthermore, Bakalash does not even suggest a situation where “dates are utilized for distinctly characterizing said subject-oriented data when a plurality of tables containing operational data with duplicate primary keys are combined in said historical data warehouse,” in the specific context claimed by applicant (emphasis added).

With respect to the subject matter of Claim 21, presently incorporated into each of the independent claims, the Examiner has rejected the same under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakalash, in view of Carothers, in further view of Carothers et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,578,857-hereinafter “Carothers ‘857”). Specifically, the Examiner has relied on Col. 8, lines 29-33 in Carothers ‘857 to make a prior art showing of applicant’s claimed technique “wherein said subject-oriented data is stored in said historical data warehouse with an associated creation date and deletion date derived from said Relational Database Management System dates.”

Specifically, the Examiner has stated that Carothers ‘857 teaches an ending date that is equivalent to applicant’s claimed “deletion date.” Applicant respectfully asserts that the ending date in Carothers ‘857 relates to the ending date of the record set, where the record set is with respect to a load control table. Clearly, an ending date of a set of records does not meet applicant’s claimed “subject-oriented data [that] is stored in said historical data warehouse with an associated creation date and deletion date” (emphasis added).


- 13 -

Again, applicant respectfully asserts that the Bakalash reference, when taken alone and in combination with Carothers, does not meet all of applicant's specific claim language, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove to each of the independent claims. Thus, a notice of allowance or a proper prior art showing of all of applicant's claim limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

Thus, all of the independent claims are deemed allowable. Moreover, the remaining dependent claims are further deemed allowable, in view of their dependence on such independent claims.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. AMDCP038).

Respectfully submitted,
Zilka-Kotab, PC


Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100